

DRAFT NOTES:
Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 9/23/99
9:30-12:30

AGENDA:

- **Purpose of WMDT (charge)**
- **Schedule for presenting information to DT**
- **Identification of reasonable assets**
- **Coordination with other programs**

I. WMDT Charge (and deliverables)

- ID actions for Stage 1
- Cost of actions
- Regulatory steps in developing actions
- Schedule for developing actions
- Operational constraints by action
- Necessary agreements
- Rules of allocation of assets
- Rules of operation
- Assurances to parties expecting benefits

C: Uncomfortable with CT defining roles for DT.

C: There are only a few actions that can be defined at the expected level of detail.

Q: Do we include actions that improve water supply reliability? R: Yes, both amount and reliability. We should adopt words presented in Water Management Strategy.

C: Need to cover governance. How EWA relates to b2, etc.

C: We need to get beyond the words to substance and real action, because the CALFED process is in big trouble.

C: Governance should be put up front.

C: Framework should focus on what we will do by November.

C: All of these deliverables are doable by November, except assurances.

C: We should consider a range of alternatives and recommend one alternative.

C: The framework being prepared by December should have some detail to fulfill what the Governor and Secretary want.

C: We should suggest things we would like to achieve. What is possible and what is not.

C: Concerned that we have created too many new layers in the process of defining an EWA.

R: CALFED has been directed to be in a position to implement the EWA next year. We need to develop the details to carry out this direction. With sufficient detail they can direct this team to carry out actions over a staged time frame.

C: We should be going out and making the necessary agreements to make the EWA real.

C: We will need a budget, rules for the EWA entity, and an EWA entity to start the EWA.

C: The Small Group put governance last.

C: Lester wants to put proposals in front of DT. So how far we get by Dec and ROD is key question.

C: We should be telling them what we can do.

Closure: a small group of people will take comments and revise charge document for distribution to CT before Tuesday. CALFED management will decide what goes before DT.

II. Schedule of Meeting Groups

BJ Miller presented table of meeting groups.

C: Some of the meetings have no content - we should divide decisions into bites that ultimately reach toward a final decision.

C: We need decisions on finance and baseline before we can make some of the other scheduled decisions.

R: We could get the basic principles of finance and baseline alternatives.

C: It is too early for financing - we need to develop assets first.

C: We need to show the logic of what we are proposing.

S: Suggest that we give them both matrices formats.

C: A linear decision process never works - we should be giving them whole packages - full scenarios. We should get to full scenarios quickly.

C: We have some analytical work necessary so that we can evaluate alternatives - packages. We haven't shown them the analysis work we have done to evaluate packages.

C: We should touch on issues in Tuesdays meeting - build agreement.

C: Governance and assurances need more emphasis - they involve separate decisions.

S: Need subgroups to address critical issues.

C: Need to get away from their process and get to what we have to do.

C: We have 13 Tuesdays with 3 hours each - not a lot of time - got to move quickly.

S: We should create a detailed schedule of how this group will support decision process. When we will have data and analyses available to present to DT - A work plan for this group.

S: We should go in next Tuesday with a whole scenario - each week would refine scenarios.

S: Next Tues we should define the universe of scenarios and clarify that we will work on scenarios.

III. Assets for Stage 1

Dave Fullerton presented assets lists for early and late Stage 1.

Lists include realistic assets. We have information needs for each assets.

We are to present lists to DT on Tues.

Early Stage 1

14. Increase Banks capacity

a. 500 cfs booster

b.8.5 kcfs capacity July-Sept

c.expand use period.

15.Access to surplus project capacity (conveyance, pumping, storage)

16.Right of EWA to borrow project water and visa versa.

17.Ground water - Kern and Semitropic

18.Markets

19.Access to non-project storage

20.Relaxation of E/I ratio.

S: We should add purpose of each asset to tables.

S: We should elaborate on constraints and process of approval.

C: Markets - agencies have no control over these unlike other assets

C: There is an analysis available of how much water we can put through the Delta.

C: Market purchases could be for environment or for water market use.

C: Incentives could be offered by CALFED for the water market. Put money into infrastructure (wells).

S: Core peak (demand shifting) would help San Luis low point. If we combine GW, markets, demand shifting we can do some very creative things.

S: We should split up assets into lists by category.

C: DT wants to get all options down - then flush out details.

S: Suggest add GW substitution in North Valley. Willing participation R: put in list 2.

S: Consider purchase of Delta ag water.

S: Add a column on for what asset is used for.

S: Add a column on what is needed for asset.

S: Suggest crop shifting as an asset.

S: Add a column for cost.

R: We only need three columns: name, description, how we intend to develop needed info.

We should gear these to non-involved parties.

S: We should define who will take charge of this task of perfecting assets. Each asset will have a development team under the lead.

S: We should make assignments by row and column.

S: We should get names so they can draft up Tues deliverable.

C: The approval process will require other talents - columns (e.g., finance, assurances).

S: Add SJ re-watering as a low point tool under demand shifting.

C: List what CALFED might do to improve environment and what to improve water supply and reliability.

S: Need to look at the effect of agency decisions and market - bigger picture.

C: Assets are dependent on one another.

C: Qualification: 1) CALFED purchases? Yes; 2) we are aware of market problem - need some analysis of effects.

R: We might have some positive effects on the market.

C: Consider needs of programmatic 404 to give us focus.

Dave presented Late Stage 1 List

S: Add Ground water assets: South Sacramento County (Galt) GW basin; East SJ Basin; SNAGWMA - urban Sacramento; Madera Ranch; West Central Basin; Gravelly Ford include:

1. Groundwater substitution with artificial recharge
2. Protections from third party impacts.
3. Empty basin before developing storage

Q: Could we use East Side Reservoir as a buffer. R: Yes, but capacity limited - fills at 300 TAF per year.

C: These end of Stage 1 assets are more fuzzy.

R: But they help to show long term feasibility of program.

C: Concern about putting changes of standard in mix - going backward.

Water Quality Assets (could also be used in Stage 1)

Q: Hood - Mokelumne connector? R: probably Stage 2.

S: Move ag drains away from intakes.

S: Purchase of Delta ag lands.

S: Selenium and salinity management

S: Coordination of Delta island releases during winter spike.

Other Assets

C: fish screens

C: ERP habitat

S: Reservoir reoperation

Closure: Identify assignments by asset. Team leader defined by column and by row. Resource people by column.

III. Coordination and Integration with Other Programs + Issues

ESA Issues:

- Biological Opinions
- Multispecies Conservation Strategy
- Regulatory Certainty
- NCCP
- Recovery Certainty

CVPIA:

- VAMP
- b1, b2, b3
- AFRP
- Level 4 Refuge acquisitions

ERP:

- Category III
- ERP habitat programs
- Crediting ERP benefits

CMARP:

- monitoring needed to implement EWA
- measurement of ERP benefits
- Direct CMARP to measure
- Testing hypotheses

WMS Stage 1:

- transfer efficiency and water quality
- MOA for 404
- Storage
- who manages EWA

Other

- Transfer program
- water efficiency program
- water quality program
- SWP/CVP
- harvest management program
- NEPA/CEQA compliance
- local groundwater management programs
- mitigation for indirect impacts
- Trinity River
- State Board Water Rights hearings
- Corps Comprehensive Study
- SDIP
- Ops Group
- VAMP
- Hatchery program

C: governance and financing - get their feedback on definable principles

S: Do an assessment on asset costs - availability of funds

S: Could have several scenario packages

C: Subset of DNCT could start working. List of added work already developed. What is plan for additional tech work.

S: Put together a scenario

S: Let DT define what they want to see.

R: But we should ID things that could be done.

C: get scenario range out in front

C: ID knobs - not how far to turn them.
C: Want DT to tell us to run scenarios.
C: Two ways to problem solve - we should go both ways
Q: How much freedom do we have in conducting further analyses? R: A lot.